## United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



**EXHIBITS** 

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

B

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VS.

DAVID N. BUF R, ET AL

AN APPEAL FROM THE JUDGMETT OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBITS OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT
DAVID N. BUBAR



PAUL W. ORTH of HOPPIN, CAREY & POWELL 266 Pearl Street Hartford, Connecticut 06103

## INDEX OF EXHIBITS

|     |   | Pages |
|-----|---|-------|
| ı.  | Summation of Rudolph Lion Zalowitz on         |       |
|     | January 8, 1976                               | 1-53  |
| II. | Finding on Motion to Review Application of    |       |
|     | Rudolph Lion Zalowitz to Appear Pro Hac Vice, |       |
|     | October 16, 1975 in State of Connecticut v.   |       |
|     | David N. Bubar, Fairfield County Superior     |       |
|     | Court No. 23138                               | 54-7  |

NOTE: This volume is filed in quadruplicate (with a copy to the United States Attorney) at the suggestion of the Clerk's office, and in lieu of submission of defendant's Motion to Supplement Record dated September 7, 1976.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

vs.

Criminal N-75-59

CHARLES D. MCELLER, et al.,

Defendants.

New Haven, Connecticut January 8, 1976

Before:

Hon. JON O. NEWMAN, U.S.D.J.

SUMMATION OF: RUDOLPH LION ZALOWITZ

THE COURT: Are you ready?

MR. ZALOWITZ: I said I would be, your Honor, and by the Master's grace, I'm here.

(Jury entered courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Zalowitz.

MR. ZALOWITZ: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, my confrere counsel, I stand here with humility, dignity, before the most honored assemblage of men and women: the jury.

In this case, I stand here with respect, but not to curry favor or sympathy from anyone, for what I have to say comes from my heart. What I have to say, I believe, is the truth, as best as I know it to be.

We have spent time here before a most honored jurist,

Jon O. Newman, for a number of weeks, and, yea, even a number of

months. Much has been spoken, thousands of words have been

uttered, charges have been made, perhaps hundreds and thousands

of pages have been transcribed, all in the effort to seek the

truth.

And I am standing here in the same regard, in an effort to seek the truth, not in my name, but in God's name.

Reverend David Bubar has been charged by an indictment.

Please bear in mind, the Court will, no doubt, instruct you,

for it is his province, his realm, and his respected duty, with

respect to the meaning and the significance of the word

"indictment".

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, therefore, in the interests of and with the knowledge that the Court will so instruct you, I will make no further reference to the meaning of "indictment".

You will, no doubt, recognize that through this entire period Reverend David Noble Bubar and I have stood separate and apart as we do now even at counsel table. But, yea, he and I have both stood here alone. We stood here. We have stood here to meet our obligations that the good heavenly Father wills.

We stood here, and we're being tried by the United States Government in the District Court of Connecticut.

It is with respect that I say that the United States Government is represented by eminent counsel: Peter C. Dorsey, Mr. Clark and Mr. Dow. Very qualified men. And, I believe, dedicated men.

We stand here charged with -- as if we were already condemned, and, yet, God will not allow a decree of condemnation to go unchallenged.

Now, when I say the Lord God, I mean the Supreme

Power, Jesus cf Nazareth, and all of the disciples here on Earth

are here for the one purpose, to spread the truth.

It is with a heavy heart that I stand here, and, yet,
I stand here with no fear. For the Master said, "Never fear,
never be in anxiety, for I am at all times with you." This is
the feeling that Reverend Bubar and I have had all the way

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUE

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

We have not bowed to anyone. We stand on our feet as the Master directs me and Reverend Bubar to stand. And I stand here on behalf of Reverend Bubar.

Now, it is common knowledge that we may not recognize the significance of gold or diamonds until we brush away any earth or soil of earth of contamination from either gold or diamonds.

Now, we are standing here, and there are a number of counts, of which the learned Court will instruct you from. As to the number of counts, I leave it within the province of the Court.

Let me, and for Reverend Bubar, say that at this moment we acknowledge one truth, that we are but mortals here on Earth, and that excludes no one, and as mortals, we acknowledge that we have all sinned. We acknowledge that the Saviour came on Earth to absolve those sins and to allow those things to be paid at a price of ransom, which He and He along was the one who was ransomed, so that all who have sinned could go free, so that we can have a world of peace and blessings.

And amongst those blessings, we assert that we will not, nor have we at any time, harmed anyone. We acknowledge, and, yea, we have taken great pains throughout this trial to

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reperters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICE I

141 CHURCH STREET
NEW HAVEN CONNECTICUT

7 8

acknowledge the Supreme Power and the word of God. And please, ladies and gentlemen, remember that that word of God is not to be taken lightly by any person here or anywhere in the world, and that word of God is embodied in the book known as the Bible.

You will note that for this long period of time that we were here in this courtroom, that not one witness -- and I emphasize that -- not one witness had the courage to stand up when he was allegedly sworn in as -- which ceremony was conducted by two honored people, Miss Frances Consiglio, Deputy Clerk and Mr. Kevin Rowe -- but at no time did any one of the witnesses refuse to swear or affirm unless their left hand was placed on the Bible, the word of God, and their right hand lifted thusly.

But, amazingly, the Master has a way of coming into the light and to distinguish the light from the darkness. He did in the personage of one man, and that one man was J. Bernard Ricks, who had a Bible with him, you will no doubt recall, and said he will tell that which he has to tell on the Bible.

No other person has ever done that. The parade -- and I withdraw the word "parade" -- but the group of people who took the stand one by one, took the stand and, yet, I wonder, and I wonder well, how many of these people actually had the faith and truth in God to tell the absolute truth from this witness stand here.

Now, we do recall the swearing-in processes, and I might mention that they were, to the best of my recollection,

21

22

23

24

25

"Do you solemnly swear to the tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?", and then after the witnesses had either affirmed or said that -- said, "Yes," the next question that was asked in this courtroom is, "What's your name and address?" But the name and address was only a mirage, because the name and address was void of the most important of the swearing services affirming or swearing to a supreme power. There -- for there was not the word of God, which -- there, to place their hand, sincerity and purpose of answering truthfully with the thought of not as to whether there might be 4- if they failed to tell the truth -- there may be perjury charged brought against them, but greater than perjury charges is you and I -and we're all mortals, for we know not what the morrow brings -have to acknowledge that we have to meet the Maker and give an accounting of ourselves at an appropriate time when we're called.

Ladies and gentlemen, I say to you, and what I say to you may be challenged by all of the other counsel, by the U.S. Attorney, and I understand by whomsoever desires to challenge these statements, but I'm asking the question: to whom did each one of these witnesses swear or affirm, and who did they identify as God? Was it a table? Was it a chair? Was it a microphone? Was it a tape recorder? Was it the Spirit of God in this courtroom?

And I am significantly proud to say that God in his

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT You will note that Reverend Bubar was the first defendant -- case to be presented and, yet, as is recited in the Book -- and there's only one book of truth, from Alpha to Omega -- Reverend Bubar's witnesses were the last to testify before your august body of ladies and gentlemen.

Now, I am saying, and I am saying this well, that our entire nation, our government, our judiciary, is all founded under the Spirit of God. I trust God shall never be excluded from our system of government, of democracy, as is self-evident in other nations throughout the world.

I challenge anyone here to contradict that each of the forefathers who were the forefathers of this nation, the Presidents of the United States, or the United States Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, or the legislators, have ever refused to place their hand on a Bible, and either to affirm or to swear in the acknowledgement of God. And I don't think I'll ever find one person, no matter how much research they do, that can say that there is.

But I want to tell you, please, and I tell it to you, suggestedly, that without that protection of God and the invocation of His name in this courtroom -- and we are facing, and we are in the year 1776, which is the bicentennial, the 200th year of our nation -- that our nation, unless we do come

Certified Stenotype Reporters

This one man who apparently created a furor, when a question was asked, and everyone here participated, as if this was a humorous incident. Everyone, I might say, perhaps with the exclusion of the honored Court, the exclusion of myself and some of you ladies and gentlemen who understood that this man took the stand not only was considered, and is considered prophetic, but he is also a religious person, and he said he would tell the truth. He did tell the truth, and he had around him the Mantle of God to protect his proclamation of the truth. That man was J. Bernard Ricks.

Reverend Bubar is going through perhaps one of the most unique, excruciating experiences that any member of the clergy has gone through since the infamous days of the Crucifixion of Christ. And, yet, he is walking the same road.

Reverend Bubar, you will note, for his truth has not taken the stand. Reverend Bubar, on the other hand, is an ordained minister of the gospel, and there have been valid accreditations of his ordination and consecration to God, which will be furnished to you as full exhibits that were approved and permitted by the honorable Court.

But in addition thereto, Reverend Bubar is the founder of his own church, the First Century Christian Fellowship Church of Memphis, Tennessee. And, yea, what else is he? Reverend Bubar

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE EARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN CONNECTICUT You will note that there's never been one word of testimony to the effect that Reverend Bubar asked for or received or
demanded the payment of any moneys, not even one cent, for his
work as a dedicated true disciple of the Master.

furnished to you as a full exhibit.

Now, now, and note well, please, we have had listed here approximately four hundred and some witnesses that were originally furnished to us by the United States Attorney's office as prospective witnesses in this case, which included also a great amount and number of special FBI agents.

Now, you can believe, for it is proper to evaluate, that if what I tell you was not true, that statement would have been brought forth to this jury, for they went to great lengths in order to establish their position.

I have said, I repeat, and I challenge the United

States Attorney and the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation

and other powerful governmental agencies, to come forward, if

they can contradict what I just have uttered to you. Reverend

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

. 9

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bubar is a poor, yet humble man. He is not wealthy. He's not here to seek glory, nor is he here to ask for your mercy. He asks for one thing: for you to understand that with the faith that he has in God, to understand his views with respect to serving God.

Yes, it is true, he has been accused. Yes, it is true that he has been here, and with great attendance and daily, to represent his position. But remember that the grand jury who indicted Reverend Bubar only heard one side of the story, the side in which the United States Government wished to portray, the side that the FBI and other governmental agencies wished to portray; and remember that the awesome power of our government is absolutely incomprehensible.

On the grand jury there is no position where an accused can refute or cross examine, nor can his counsel refute or cross examine, because his counsel is excluded from the grand jury proceedings. He cannot cross examine any of the witnesses produced before the grand jury by the United States Attorney's office. So you see, obviously, that this is a one-sided issue, a one-sided affair. As to that, I defer to the instructions of Judge Jon O. Newman, as I said previously.

Bear one thought in mind, that it is so easy to put a

men -- who cannot defend himself because of his religious

convictions, because of his consecration to God and his view to

God, and to take the stand under those circumstances would be to

be defying and desecrating Go. And this Reverend Bubar will not do. Nor has he done. And to do that, to take the stand, would also be blasphemous. And Reverend Bubar confided to me that no matter what occurs in this noble courtroom, which is protected under the flag of the United States — for the rights have been and will be always protected of every defendant and every accused so long as we have jurists of the tenor, strength and impartiality of Honorable Jon O. Newman.

He said that he doesn't stand here in fear. Neither do I. He said he will not tremble for his eyes lift for his refuge and salvation in God and in the Bible, and you will note, ladies and gentlemen, throughout the proceedings, both Reverend Bubal and I have consulted and have read and have been inspired by the Bible.

Now, it is true that much testimony has been adduced here by the U. S. Attorney, as I've acknowledged, a very capable, honored gentleman, Mr. Peter Collins Dorsey, but he did in his own dedication as a U. S. Attorney foster accusation after accusation after accusation, even so far as to state at one time that, "I don't believe that Mr. Bubar is a reverend." I'm sure as of this moment he does recognize same.

Now, here we have had over the period of weeks and, yea, months, a very fine, consistent array of government witnesses.

We have had perhaps the finest performance of testimony adduced by the U. S. Government.

Now, I cast no aspersions upon anyone. But I'd like to evaluate. For, if you will recall, yesterday afternoon, Mr. Dorsey in his summation stated to you, ladies and gentlemen, as to the credibility of the witnesses, and it was with great pride that he said it: remember the deportment of John W. Shaw; and if I were a school teacher, I would give him A for deportment, but I would not give him A for telling the truth.

I want to say this: Mr. Shaw from this witness stand, a well prepared, well coached robot, testified as the government wished him to and, yet, for whose protection and purpose?

You will note that each time a question was asked, and
I was in full view, Mr. Shaw would move his chair forward, as
I'm doing now, answer yes or no, or with very, very limited wo and then sit back, and if we had a rocking chair robot seated here testifying. I want you to consider as to whether this is deportment or whether this is credibility.

I don't think so, and I suggest to you, ladies and gentlemen, it is not. I have said that John Shaw could verily be typified as the all-American boy, clean cut, shaven, immaculate, fingers — nails, manicured, who stood here and sat down and told his story from this witness box and stand, and he defiled God. He told a very lurid story. He told a story as if he were an automate, as if any time the U. S. Attorney or any of the men affiliated with the U. S. Attorney's office pressed a button they would know the answer to the question that was

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

asked. We did not have that availability, and especially the Reverend Bubar didn't, for Reverend Bubar has no funds.

You will note that Reverend Bubar had approximately on this stand -- approximately sixteen, seventeen or eighteen witnesses that was allowed at government expense by the Honorable Jon O. Newman.

As to other issues, I do not comment on same, for I am constrained and shall not violate my constrainment.

Now, I ask you to consider, consider well, before

John W. Shaw took the stand, how many dry runs did he have in the

offices of either the FBI in Pittsburgh, in New Haven, in the

state offices of the state police, as to what his testimony was

going to be?

Now, word is that he did respond punctually with slight inconsistencies. But does that mean that he responded with an "in truth"? It is for you to determine.

It becomes difficult for you, ladies and gentlemen, except from what you see on the witness stand, to be able to evaluate into the heart and mind for the truth of any witness who has taken the stand, and especially John W. Shaw.

For you do know that there's been much made here of the word "psychic", "prophecy", "so-called psychic", "so-called minister", every innuendo that bespeaks desecration of Reverend Bubar. And we had to come to great lengths to establish before this Court -- and it wasn't done once, it was done more than once,

prior to the commencement of the previous position -- was done prior to the commencement of this trial before you ladies and gentlemen.

And, yet, as honored and fine U. S. Attorney dared to say -- and I repeat it -- dated to say and questioned the ordination of Reverend Bubar.

Now, you heard testimony of the fact that John W. Shaw did in his presentation, and was, in the preparation of this presentation before you ladies and gentlemen, that he was examined, cross examined, triple examined, fine comb examined by many members of the investigation and of the FBI.

I cast no aspersions upon the FBI, for I believe they are dedicated servants of the government and, therefore, allegedly servants of us, the public. So I make no unjust accusation or evaluation.

But do you remember that at one stage -- and I think it was at the time that I cross examined Mr. Shaw, as to any other activities that he had, as to whether at any time, in Pittsburgh or otherwise, before he came forward to ask to speak to U. S. Attorney Dorsey, for he wanted to unburden his soul.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you really think he wanted to unburden his soul, or do you believe, as I do, that he wanted to make a plea bargaining deal that no one could refuse, not even the U. S. Attorney Dorsey?

Now, what is the background of John W. Shaw? He is

the main prosecution witness. Around him revolves the accusations. Is he as pure as he wants you to believe?

Now, sure, yesterday, Mr. Dorsey in his presentation said, "Well, you know, he's -- he was a coconspirator."

Wonderful. But what did John W. Shaw have to gain by taking the stand except a position of advantage, unmerited, to save himself. He no doubt would have -- and I say this -- would have sworn on -- and without a Bible, as he didn't have a Bible here -- he would have sworn and accused even his mother or father of an implication of anything if he could but save himself, and this is the fiber of witness who has taken the stand to accuse Reverend David Bubar.

I am saying that no matter how well rehearsed -- and I must concede that it was perhaps the most amazing rehearsal, as I envisioned it to be, that any government could utilize to accuse innocent people.

Now, it is easy, as Mr. Dorsey wished to infer, that each one of his statements he did not back off, except with slight incensistencies, that Mr. Dorsey wanted to bring forth to you that one and one makes two.

But there's many, many different ways to come to the two. One and one surely makes two, but three minus the deletion of God could also make two. Think about it.

I am saying that because John W. Shaw recognized his position, never as a man who comes here for the first time and

says, "Yes, I was involved." But, ladies and gentlemen, John W.

Shaw has a pattern, a pattern that we of the government, we of
our nation, through our respective, honored governmental adherance
and offices, saw fit to take this very, very pure man, John W.

Shaw, who never was involved in anything before, and say, "Take
the stand and we'll protect you."

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, if you could get that red carpet treatment in the same position? But, you see, the government was hard pressed, exceedingly hard pressed, to be able to find one or othersto place blame on. And they saw a man who would sell away his soul, and he has, in this courtroom -- sell away his soul and sell away his fear of God, just to be able to curry favor, and you note at the very beginning here today I said Reverend Bubar and I both refuse to curry favor from mortals.

And I say further we refuse to bow our knee to any mortal, but to the Master above us, for to him we are dedicated.

Now, John Shaw, pure, wants to be able to make amends, and the government, in its desire to gain convictions, truly sold away -- as Jacob and Esau -- sold away the birthright of America, for some purpose. And the purpose is -- and the birthright was the birthright that belonged to one and was sold away to another under deception.

Now, I assert that there's deception here today. I am saying that -- whether you ladies and gentlemen are aware -- that

there was a plea bargaining arrangement. As to the complete details of that plea bargaining arrangement, I may be constrained to go into it full detail. So, therefore, it is with caution that I'm speaking of this subject.

Amongst the plea bargaining arrangement, I might add -for it was brought in by my cross examination and, therefore, is
evidence before you ladies and gentlemen -- is that John W. Shaw
admitted on this stand that he did and he was one of the major
persons who set a fire in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and he said
that he made it appear as if it were an accident. An accident.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know if you're aware of this, but this particular fire in Pittsburgh was within 50 feet of a church and a minister's home, St. Michael the Angel's, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Now, just consider well. He said that he made it appear as if it was an accident. But, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you within your reasoning and the full utilization of your intellect, as I know you will, whether you can plea bargain away a crime if the fire department of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, if the police department of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania has no knowledge of you ever being a suspect? I challenge it. And I challenge it openly here, and I am saying that this plea bargaining arrangement included bargaining away something that no one has never known, yea, even up to the time that I asserted it here.

I say this is a defilement of our processes. I say it

is a defilement of our justice. But it did happen.

I am asking you: did John W. Shaw come forth with a spirit of being contrite, remorseful, or did he come forth to testify here with a spirit of, quote, "I'm going to endeavor" -- and that quotation, bythe way, ladies and gentlemen, is not the quotation of John W. Shaw, it's a paraphrasing by myself -- that I -- and I withdraw the word "quote" -- but did he come here only in his endeavor to save himself caring not who and which personages, innocent, he could accuse?

For I assure you that if it had been that in order to make this plea bargaining arrangement, he might have done it to anyone. And I am not pointing to anyone. But he might have done it. And I think, in fact, this is what motivated him. Because, if you will recall, at one stage he said, "I don't care what my attorney has to say, I want to speak to the U. S. Attorney Dorsey." And, you know, he did.

Now, the U. S. Attorney Dorsey, to me, is a honored man, and, to me, he's a man of obligation, and I say it with respect, but, nevertheless, John W. Shaw, the alleged pure one, even endeavored to and did put the U. S. Attorney's office into the veritable truth of partaking in this plea bargaining arrangement.

Shall we break now, your Honor?

THE COURT: We'll go to the half way point.

MR. ZALOWITZ: How much time, sir?

THE COURT: Quarter to two.

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reperters

654 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

MR. ZALOWITZ: Quarter to two. Thank you, your Honor.

Instead of being a pure witness, he was an adulterated witness. Instead of being unadulterated, without any venom or poison in him, or contamination in him, he wasn't, he was the opposite. He was contaminated, ladies and gentlemen, by Lucifer, the alleged Prince of Light who blocks out all the light so as to do that which he wishes to do in the darkness, while he is the Prince on Earth.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, remember this, and I am sure you do, as those of you who are -- as I believe, those who understand, those who read and those who are knowledgeable -- and I assert that you all are -- that the same very thing that was accomplished with John W. Shaw and the plea bargaining arrangement that was effectuated through the U. S. Attorney's office was the same type of position that was attempted three times on Jesus of Nazarene.

And, if you will recall, the only one who had the courage in this world was Jesus, who said to Satan, "Get in back of me, Satan," all others succumbed. I think it's something to think about.

And that's why Reverend Bubar and I are standing here and we say we have no fear, we have no anxiety, so long as we endeavor to serve God in truth and wisdom.

Now, it is simple for man to play with the lives of others. That man who made the play was John W. Shaw.

But Reverend Bubar and I stand and looked for the help, not just for mortals, but we look for the help, from the hills from when it comes, the true help.

We're saying that in the presentation of, and by, the
U. S. Attorney -- and he recognizes it, I'm certain -- that if the
testimony of John W. Shaw is not to be believed or is not
credible, the government has failed to make their case.

And I say failed not by reason of any ineptness on the presentation of the case by the U. S. Attorney's office. They have failed because God will not allow the forces of evil to overtake the forces of good. God will not allow the forces of might to subdue the forces of right.

God is the only protector that the innocent have, for we do not have him as a protector and one to whom we shall look for aid from the hills, then to whom shall we ask for aid?

There is no other.

And when all else fails, everyone seems to turn to God, but that's not the position with Reverend David Bubar. He served God all the time, and will continue to serve the Master.

May I, but for moment, transgress. Here's a book that was introduced as an exhibit for the defendant Reverend Bubar, which he has written with the spirit in him of the heavenly Father. This book personifies Reverend David Noble Bubar, for he is the one whose heart has been spoken here. He is the one who is standing up in God's name.

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 141 CHURCH STREET
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

. 1

Now, we believe, Reverend Bubar and I both believe, that God will not allow any satanic forces, no matter who presents these forces to overpower the truth or overpower God, or the sort of truth that God uses in this world.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you recall in your youth that when you had to pick a fight with someone, you always pick the fight with one who could not defend. If you wanted to gain an advantage. But if you had the spirit of God in you, you wouldn't do it.

Now, take a look what happened here. Full recognition of the fact that Reverend Bubar cannot take the stand for the religious principles which I've enumerated.

Reverend Bubar, therefore, is weaker than John Shaw here. John Shaw has the mantle of protection of the government. He's given whatever the government feels is proper, and he is given certain rights, which have been, I believe, enumerated previously. I shall not go into that, either.

But, then, again, who do you attack if you have evil motivations? You attack a person who is ill. You attack a person who is old, unprepared, a person who is not capable of defending himself. That's the one you pick on, and that's the one who meets all of the objectives against Reverend Bubar here.

So you say, if you are evil motivated, you take a chance. Why not Reverend Bubar? Look at him. If you have -- and I am sure you ladies and gentlemen have had all of this

. 1

opportunity to observe Reverend Bubar. You recognize, I'm certain, that he's a son of Abraham and a son God.

There's no guile in him, for if there was any guile
in him, the government would have brought it to your attention.
There's no hatred in him, for all he has ever endeavored to do
in his life was to seek to do good, the very same thing that Jesus
sought and paid a price, and the same very thing as other
disciples of Jesus has done, and they paid a price. And then
you begin to wonder: who pays the price for the evil ones?
Those who are innocent.

Reverend Bubar, as acknowledged by witnesses who have taken the stand, such as Mr. Charles D. Moeller, and his fine, honored wife, Frances Moeller, told you that they confided and respected and sought spiritual guidance, at all hours of the morning, afternoon, evening, without time limitation to call him whenever they wanted to to seek help.

If you will note, at one stage, when it was said from this stand -- that when Charles Moeller said, and he consulted with -- spiritually with Reverend Bubar with regard to his daughter and Reverend Bubar gave him the spiritual aid, gave him the spiritual fortitude and gave him the aid of the Master's spirit on high, then, and about that time, Charles Moeller was led to Christ. And he has, from his testimony, followed that road.

Now, what is Reverend Moeller -- what is Reverend

Bubar -- and please arise, Reverend Bubar -- what does he personify, except Godliness and one other thing: naivete?

And if naivete is a crime, then I wonder how many of us would not be guilty of that crime?

The overall truth is that Reverend Bubar has gone forth all of his lifetime to do nothing but help others, not to injure others, not to harm others, and you will note that Mr. Michael Festa when he took the stand and spoke about Southern Supply, and when Mr. Moeller took the stand and spoke about his position in his endeavor to purchase a company in Aurora, Colorado, each one of them were under the true fact that whatever Reverend Bubar was going to get was to go to his doing good for others through his church.

And I might add to you his church and his work is the work that a disciple does for all people. No exceptions. You don't have to be affluent to go to Reverend Bubar's house of worship. You don't have to wear any special clothes. You have to go and seek the way of God, the purity. That's the only thing.

many people as you can, because maybe in that way he's opening up the doors for others to follow as disciples of the Saviour.

Now, I want to make known to you ladies and gentlemen -- and it's perhaps a revelation, not the same revelation that is recited in the Book of Revelations or St. John, the

. 1

Apocalypse, or the 27th Book of the New Testament, Chapter 5, Verse 5, but as a revelation, to note, for it is self-evident here that a person without funds in this great democracy is if he were a dead corpse. Think about it.

I don't know if you ladies and gentlemen are aware of the fact that a defendant who is penurious, as distinguished from one who's affluent and has moneys, has no problem in bringing in witnesses to testify on his behalf or her behalf in defense of themselves. But God forbid if you are without funds as Reverend Bubar is.

The rules provide that you must petition the Court under rule called 17(b) of the Criminal Procedure -- Code -- of the United States Code, wherein it becomes incumbent, as the rules resite, to petition, request the honorable court for his permission as to whom you may have as a defendant's witness. The burden is almost unbelievable.

Now, I am saying this with absolute respect to the kindness, to the integrity, to the understanding, to the impartiality of a great jurist, Jon O. Newman, but, nevertheless, that burden is still there and we were faced with that burden.

Beyond that, I shall not discuss the subject.

You know, when you do not have witnesses -- and the Constitution says, and the Bill of Rights says, and the Declaration of Independence says, and the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution says: equality. Equality.

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

But do you know what that word "equality" means if you are a poor person? It's a mirage. It isn't there.

But, however, if we were in the position, Reverend Bubar and I, to be able to have the witnesses which we have requested, and by the direction of the Court, denied, we wouldn't stand here in this position, for we are now -- not now even being supplicant to any power.

But what we're saying is this: consider well if you, ladies and gentlemen, were in the position, whether member of the ministry or no, but in the position of not being affluent, but being penurious or without funds -- and I dare say in our America the percentages revolve itself into more or less the latter position that I stated -- how do you think you could stand up and defend against the awesome power of the United States Government?

I am saying that which I believe to be the truth. I am saying that no one can by dedication, not even for money, but the addage is that if you do have the opportunity to have your witnesses, your defense will be of significant strength.

Now, I am not saying that our defense is anything but with strength, because we stand here with the greatest power of strength in the world, and we care not who contradicts us, the strength and the power of God.

Shall we break here, sir?

THE COURT: We will take our recess at a quarter to

three.

MR. ZALOWITZ: Yes, your Honor.

I am saying also that Reverend -- that notwithstanding the fact that Reverend Bubar is a poor man financially, he is perhaps the wealthiest man in this nation, for he's a man in faith and belief in God, and we contend that this faith and belief in God will overcome all positions and all challenges. We ontend that as we walk through the garden of roses, even the pricks of the rosebuds and the rose stems shall not deter us from going forward, as it did not deter Jesus in Gethsemane, for he walked the very same road as Reverend Bubar is walking here today. And I might add it's a very lonely road.

People have discwned the Reverend Bubar. Yea, people have discwned the Nazarene, too. Yea, even Peter disavoed the Nazarene thrice, and, yet, reverend Bubar is walking this very road. It's a desolate road that seems to go to nowhere, but to the inferno abyss.

But before this will ever happen, as I have maintained through the entire proceedings, God will come into this courtroom and intervene.

And, ladies and gentlemen, it took many, many days for this to happen, but it did happen on January the 6th, 1976, when J. Bernard Ricks took the stand, and walked in, and when he walked in, God walked in with him and Lucifer for the first time was exited out of this courtroom.

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

3

5

4

6

8 9

10

11

.12

13

15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

25

I am saying that because of the entrance of God, that the Eternal Light is now visible and will not be extinguished by any power or force on Earth.

Now, even to those who don't want to believe, and in this great democracy, we have that right to believe or not to believe, the light is there, and God will not allow the darkness to overtake. Well, this is inevitable, and is also inevitable, as the addage goes, before the light arises, the darkest days of your life are at hand.

Ladies and gentlemen, the darkest days of the life of Reverend David Noble Bubar has been at hand and is here now.

But we have no fear, for now the light has entered.

We are not afraid or afeared of anyone, not the U. S. Attorney,

not the FBI, not the CIA, not any mortal, for we know we're

walking the road, the road and path to truth.

However, we have no hatred, either. We have no hatred to John W. Shaw. We only ask for his salvation. Instead of hatred, Reverend Bubar professes love, instead of fear.

And if we didn't have love and faith, ladies and gentlemen, Reverend Bubar would not be in this courtroom.

Reverend Bubar would have given his life, not to have to endure these many, many months. But you notice he is here. You notice I am here, as directed, and with propriety under the rules of the court structure of this great democracy.

Now, one thing we say, and we say it with absolute

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

66: PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

5 6

strength and courage, that God in his miracle and in his not totally understandable ways, or his mysterious ways, always at the right moment -- and if you reflect throughout your life, or your events of your life, he comes to the fore to defend those who are beleaguered when everyone else has walked away. He sends his angels around to insulate against the forces of evil.

Ledies and gentlemen, I want to, at the moment, speak concerning a documentation that was offered here as a full exhibit and accepted as such by the Court, Defendant's Exhibit 1177, wherein -- and the exhibit says. Flaming Sword, and with the headmast underneath the word "Flaming Sword", quote, "... with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, David N. Bubar, Editor."

I will not make any comment because it is an exhibit.

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, it is for you to read,

observe --

THE COURT: They will have it in the jury room.

Mr. Zalowitz.

MR. ZALOWITZ: Yes, sir. I shall. As you say, sir.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, in my presentation, you heard me refer to the Spiritual Outreach Society -- and there's been many, many words spoken of same -- we have, by the kindness of the Court, in the fashion which I have stated a few moments ago -- were able to bring some of the parishioners -- they were ladies -- to travel from Memphis, Tennessee, here to evaluator to

speak of the work that Reverend Bubar does with the Spiritual Outreach Society, and that's reflected in Defendants' Exhibit 1174 as to the purposes of the SOS, which means Spiritual Outreach Society.

And if I just were to, as I shall, enumerate the significance here as to the purposes I've alluded to, as to the dependence upon God, which is fact, with respect to helping others, with respect to prayer and meditation, with respect to supporting your house of worship, and it's all eludicated in detail on this document, and you will have the benefit of same in the jury room.

Now, I did take time to bring into focus -- for there's been much testimony here from the very inception, as if Reverend Bubar was just a so-called reverend. Self-proclaimed reverend. But please remember, ladies and gentlemen, whether you are a self-proclaimed reverend and you have the spirit of God in you, I assert that you, too, are a reverend or reverendess, with respect to the ladies, so long as the spirit of God is with you, and is not to be made mockery of, or cast aspersions as to your dedication to God.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, a great projection, and under unusual circumstances, twice in this courtroom, once in your presence and once previously, not in your presence, but, however, with the knowledge of both the U.S. Attorney Dorsey and with the, I presume, understandable position and knowledge

of the Honorable Jon O. Newman, I brought in the ordination of Reverend Bubar.

Now, this is a certificate of the ordination, it is a Xerox copy thereof, accepted as a full exhibit, Defendants' Exhibit 1167, which refers to the ordination of Reverend Bubar as a minister in the Stanton Baptist Church in Stanton, Tennessee on the 18th day of June, 1954, and the signatures of the ordaining council are subscribed thereto. This, too, is a full exhibit, and will be offered into the jury room.

Amazingly, there were photographs made of this ordination wherein Reverend Bubar was ordained on the date that I set forth, and that is reflected in Defendants' Exhibit 1170 as a full exhibit, wherein Reverend Bubar is holding with respect and pride, as I do here, the Bible, and the speaker is the head of the entire ordaining committee, Robert G. Lee. And that will be offered to you, and if you will note, that Reverend Bubar is the gentleman to the extreme left of this photo.

And then — and then, a photograph marked Defendants' Exhibit 1171, which is a full exhibit, on that same very day, shows the presentation of the Bible to Reverend David Bubar. That, too, will be in your room.

Now, you'll note from this photo, because there's been so many photos included in this case as to identification,

I want you please to recognize the fact that this is Reverend

Bubar back in 1964, and if there are any photos that could

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contradict it -- for there have been many that have been offered here by the U. S. Government -- I certify that that is the photo of Reverend Bubar.

Prior to the entrance into this courtroom of a man with gray hair -- and then again I usurped that the consecration -- and it's a photograph, Defendants' Exhibit 1172, it's a full exhibit -- the consecration of Reverend David Bubar with the placing on the head, as is the consecration services of the faith of which Reverend Bubar attends.

You note him kneeling, the gentleman in the light -you note him kneeling, the gentleman in the light gray suit with his right foot upward and his left foot there, and that is an exhibit known as Exhibit -- Defendants' Exhibit 1172. And at the same time, on the same subject, the ordination services of David N. Bubar into gospel ministry which was help at the Stanton Baptist Church, June the 18th, 1964, as exhibited by the Defendants' Exhibit 1173, wherein -- and this is significant -- wherein there was a prayer recited, and that prayer epitomizes Reverend Bubar, and I just state it to you. The prayer goes thusly: "A prayer. Lord, lay Thy hand upon this your brother and may Thy spi b: fall fresh upon him, cleansing his heart and his life for service, making him holy, Lord, and pure within. Give him compassion and power to follow. Teach him to trust and delight in Thy will, trusting in Thee, Lord, to wait patiently, God of Salvation, teach him to be still.

> SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

8

.

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

In Jesus' name, we pray for blessings now. Lay Thy hands upon him as we now bow."

And that, too, will be in the jury room.

MR. ZALOWITZ: May I ask for the break, sir?

THE COURT: All right. The jurors may take their

recess now.

(Recess taken.)

(Jury entered courtroom at 3:10 p.m.)

MR. ZALOWITZ: Ladies and gentlemen, there's been much talk, some evidence, of the word of prediction and prophecy with regard to Reverend Bubar. For truly he's the most recognized person outside of Charles Moeller here.

A significant question comes up in the testimony which I'd like to bring into the position of the analysis of this jury, concerning Reverend Bubar, and there's been much discussion of the words "water treatment".

I would like to point out to you, if you will recall—
for it is your recollection that counts, not mine, not the U. S.
Attorney, nor not even the recollection of the learned jurist
that controls, but is your recollection as to the evidence here.

If you will recall, there was a gentleman who came forth from
Washington, D.C., by the name of Mr. Nixon of a lawfirm in
Washington, D.C. I have the firm of Cushman, Darby and Cushman,
and you will recall, I'm certain, that the discussior wasn't only
the word "water treatment", the words and the discussion wasn't

"water reclamation". Now, there's a vast difference. The same way as we cannot compare two men or two women just being Homo sapiens, or people. We all have our distinguishing characteristics and our distinguishing characters, and our distinguishing thought processes.

And you will recall, I believe, that Mr. Nixon truly became aware that this was not just a casual water treatment process, of which there probably are many, but the process was a process of water reclamation.

Now, there's much talk by Mr. Dorsey with regard to

Reverend Bubar and to the fact that he was not an accomplished

technician in the process. He even alluded to a fact which is not

true, that there was probably larceny or stealing by Reverend Bubar

of the process from the company in Aurora.

I'm sure that there is common knowledge amongst people of intellect, as this jury is composed of, that some of the greatest inventors in the history of our great nation -- none of them were accomplished technicians. For example, Thomas Alva Edison. He knew nothing about light, any more than I happen to know about audio-vision. Fulton, Marconi, Henry Ford, McCormack of the farm equipment industries, John D. Rockefeller and many others too numerous to even endeavor to mention, because I could probably fill out from now until December, 1976 to enumerate them. Suffice it that I offered to your judgment.

Now, you recall on the subject of water reclamation, that

I had certain witnesses here by the name of Frank Witek, by the name of Mike Festa, by the name of Tamara Graham, and specifically, and not excluding the others which I just mentioned, Mr. Dorsey seemed to allude that none of these people had any knowledge on water reclamation. But if he were to reflect, as I'm asking this jury to, you'll find that these people were with full knowledge, because they were in the division of research and development.

Now, the processes of any invention has to first be formented by an idea of a person. Otherwise, none of us would be seated on this jury with a honored multitude of dress and color, for we'd all be either white, gray, blue, or otherwise, but in the mind of some man or woman, there was the motivation of the thinking processes of improvement of that which is acknowledged to have been here now.

Even this mircrophone. For maybe 25 years ago or so, or 30, we had no microphones in the courtroom, and perhaps 40 years ago we had no television, and perhaps time before we had no airplanes until Wilbur Wright and Orville Wright of Dayton, Ohio came into the focus and dared to have a dream, an idea, and that dream and idea was not put together by one man, but was put together by men and women who had the technical knowledge to put the jigsaw together.

So when Mr. Dorsey says Reverend Bubar had no background and so forth, how does he know what Reverend Bubar has?

> SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

Did he ever have an interview with Reverend Bubar to ascertain his background? What he has is only what the Federal Bureau of Investigation were able to endeavor to assimilate and assemble as to the background of Reverend Bubar.

Now, you recall that the subject is water reclamation, and that is a new subject that our nation is so vitally interested in, in environmental control, and this is a national problem, and it also became a problem for Sponge Rubber Products, because their bills were so astronomical that they were put in position to say, "How can we find a way to save moneys so as to operate within a profitable sphere?"

and I say, yea, even billions of dollars in order to control and conserve water, trees, and pure, live air. So that as time follows time, we shouldn't all be stifled by the lack of supply of water and pure water, and reprocessed water, and forestries and rubbers, and clothes. This is all a reprocessing position, and I dare say there is no one man -- and I don't think Mr. Dorsey can say there is, or if he does say there is, I assert -- I put him on challenge to state it to you ladies and gentlemen that there's one man or one woman who has all that knowledge in their hands.

Further subject came up in testimony and in the address to you in summation by the U. S. Attorney. \$35,000

allegedly was handed to Reverend Bubar.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

Well, to me, \$35,000 is like thirty-five million, but to a person who is a member of the ministry and who goes around helping people, and doesn't help one person, but helps many people of all faiths and denominations and religions -- and there is no barrier, because Reverend Bubar's house of worship is nondenominational.

Now, let us be analytical, let us consider -- and I am certain we're all people who are thinking -- would you presume, as the government wishes you to presume, that \$35,000 allegedly given to Reverend Bubar could buy a man, whose portrayal I have spent one and a half hours today to let you know who Reverend Bubar is, not what the newspapers write him to be, not what the magazines write him to be, not what the television programs write him to be, or the radio, but who is he? The personification of who he is is recited, as you will take it into your jury room, in the book which he has printed, the book that has a logo insignia of a fish, and that's the insignia of Reverend Bubar's book. The fish -- significantly recites the same followings of the fisherman that Jesus of Nazarene sought when he was seeking his disciples. Please think about it.

Can we validly say, as Mr. Dorsey wants you to believe, that Reverend Bubar could be bought for such a pittance of moneys, especially in the position of which he's endeavoring to substantiate, of the vastness of the claims that are involved.

> 141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN. CONNECTICUT

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD. CONNECTICUT

To do that would be to presume upon your lack of intelligence. I don't dare presume upon that, for I assert that this jury is of great significant intelligence to be able to separate the wheat from the chaff and the truth from the false-hoods and the purity from the impurities.

Now let us step one moment forth. You'll notice that Mr. Dorsey has made an effort, yesterday, to infer that Reverend Bubar was a person who was constricted to do whatever Mr. Moeller wanted him to do. That is so very far from the truth that I don't even want to comment further about it.

Now, as to the \$35,000, you will recall there was testimony adduced here that Reverend Bubar by reason of his water reclamation saved the Sponge Rubber Products Company approximately \$36,000 a year, and over the period of ten years would have saved them 36,000 times ten. The best mathematician in the world, I'm not, but, ladies and gentlemen, I offer it to you for your consideration.

You know, it's so easy to paint a picture, depending how you want the picture to come out. If I wanted to paint a picture about myself, I could paint a picture, or an artist could, that I'm wearing a black suit rightnow with a lavender shirt.

But as a matter of truth and fact, that is not so.

The government is endeavoring to paint the picture of an untruth.

Reverend Bubar, as you noted and from what the testimony

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICET

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN CONNECTICUT

ó

has been throughout the entire proceedings, is that whatever moneys Reverend Bubar ever got, he went around helping people. He looked for no personal emollients, and I say that's a wonderful characteristic of a person, religiously inclined, spiritually injected, and honestly endeavoring to live their lives.

Reverend Bubar, if the government had been able to curry the fact that Reverend Bubar took moneys and did -- played the horses, for example, many people do, or gamble, or was a philanderer, or was a person not of the spiritual knit that he is, I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that would have been brought up not once, but so many times before this jury, and it would have been self-evident.

But not one time has the government, with all their power, all their investigative positions, with all the people whom they have interviewed in Reverend Bubar's church and otherwise, including those people that they told, "Don't talk to Reverend Bubar" -- Reverend Bubar is still a free man in a free country, and if we take away the right of free speech, I say we've taken away also the right of a man, and if they've taken away the right of privacy, they likewise have eroded America, and that's part of the position that they've endeavored to do with Reverend Bubar.

Now, as to the subject of prophecy -- and you will note, because it became so apparent that every time the

United States Government said, "Bubar," I arose and interjected, even at the risk of many things, "Reverend Bubar," and finally, there had to be a concession, but, yet, yesterday, the U.S.

Attorney didn't even honor his original commitment to address the defendant as Reverend Bubar.

Is that the position of endeavoring to color a picture with a color or a paint that is not true? Think about it, it's for you to evaluate.

of U.S. Attorney Dorsey, and I think it went like this -- and if my recollection is wrong, your recollection counts, for mine is not of importance, yours is, as to what the testimony was -- Miss Kordiak -- and she's a lovely lady -- "Miss Kordiak, did Reverend Bubar ever tell you that the plant was going to burn?"

She said, "Yes," and she was very demure, and a very wonderful lady, always had been and will be, and the inference seemed to be that Reverend Bubar foretold this fire.

But, yet, the U.S. Attorney was aware -- and I don't think he will challenge same, and if he wishes to, I shall be honored to accept that challenge -- that there was a man by the name of J. Bernard Ricks who almost a year before had prophesied the fire. And you will note when J. Bernard Ricks was on the stand yesterday, efforts were made to have J. Bernard Ricks to disavow a 302 statement with regard to a fire.

Now, whomsoever was the interrogator at that time, you

will note that J. Bernard Ricks said, "That is not true." In which they tried to say that he didn't state that there'd be a fire, and merely that there would be a smokestack remaining.

You know what it takes for a man of courage who is not knowledgeable as a witness on a stand, who is a man who has tremendous background and prophecy, to be able to stand in this courtroom and to say, "No, that isn't true, that's not what I told the FBI"?

Ladies and gentlemen, you've never been interrogated by the FBI. Think how you would have stood. And think whether you would have that strength of position that J. Bernard Ricks had when he said that the FBI reports were not true.

Now, think for a moment how many other persons have taken this stand and was in such tear that whatever questions or whatever statements appeared on a 302 report, which you ladies and gentlemen heard so much about, that they'd be afraid to say, "No, the FBI misquoted me." How many have? Think about it. Very few.

You know what that word is called? Fear of the awesome power of the government and the investigative positions of the FBI.

Now, coming to that position, and to the word "prophecy", as a full exhibit, Defendants' Exhibit 1156, introduced by me on behalf of Reverend Bubar, is a 16-page printed document, wherein Reverend Bubar claims and has recited same in the Volume 2,

. 1

4 5

,

Number 7, September, 1972, issue of the "Psychic Adventurer" on pages 2 and 3, in which Reverend Bubar asserted that there was a vision that he had approximately four days after the decease of the late J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the FBI, wherein he spoke to, through a vision -- and those who are believers know that there are these visions, for our Bible is replete and full with visions -- in which Reverend Bubar recorded that which J. Edgar Hoover told him.

I'm not going to focus on any specific position here, except to say -- for I have made my commitment to the honored Court that I should not repeat any subject which I've previously gone into, and I am referring to anything that I've spoken in the first hour and a half -- but if you will read and read thoroughly when you do have this document in the jury room, and if you will note on page 2 that which I promise the Court I shall not relate, will be visible to you. And that, too, is a full exhibit, will be offered to you in the jury room.

Now, the government was aware of all these documents, for the government is the all-seeing, all-knowing invescigative power in America. Beyond that, I make no comment, it is for you, ladies and gentlemen, to follow the thought which I just asserted. Whether you follow it by reading documents, or however you do it, that is your position, but suffice it to say that the government was aware of this prediction, yea, and nay, not a prediction, prophecy, by J. Bernard Ricks of this fire a year ago.

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

What was the purpose? Why was:it withheld? Why was Reverend Bubar put in position when all he endeavors to do is to give succor, s-u-c-c-o-r, to people, to be made sucker, s-u-c-k-e-r? It is for you to consider.

Now, J. Bernard Ricks was here, and I've been honored to have him here, because he's been able to bring into focus that which has been held away from your ladies and gentlemen, and bear in mind, please, one thing: J. Bernard Ricks was subpoenaed by the defendant and not at the cost of government expense, in spite of the great burdens upon the defendant Reverend Bubar.

Now, continuing further as to the statements made in summation by the U.S. Attorney, in which he stated, to the best of my recollection, or my hearing, that Reverend Bubar was acting as a pawn in this case.

He forgot to enumerate to you, and he forgot, I'm sure, inadvertently -- but, ladies and gentlemen, you heard the evidence of Mike Festa, and when Mike Festa was recalled, and not by me, but by an honored confrere of mine, it came to pass in my query as to the subject of number two red, and how number two red, of which Mike Festa was interested in, was packed, and whether Mike Festa's operation in Aurora permitted him to store number two red -- which is, as they say, a coloring agent that is used in many different things, including footstuffs, clothes, et cetera -- that in order to be able to protect number two red --

. 1

O

which turned out, amazingly, to be a very losing business venture from which Reverend Bubar's interest would go specifically back to the good work that he was doing in his church and his religious work -- was packed and embodied in the same very containers that the government is endeavoring to say that Reverend Bubar allowed people into Plant No. 4.

number two red -- and they have checked it, ladies and gentlemen -- to find out if number two red was not packed in the same very containers that is the subject here?

Now. I'm saying, bearing in mind that Reverend Bubar was interested in number two red and the utilization of whatever moneys were to be made was to go to the good work of his church, for, as a matter of fact, he has nothing of value today, but that number two red was what was supposed to have been stored in Flant No. 4. They had — they didn't know what to do with it. They didn't know where to put it. And that number two red is stored in the very identical barrels, containers, 50-gallon, or whatever it was called, here, and verily, it was the understanding wher Reverend Bubar allowed anyone to come into those, that he was of the opinion that these items were his number two red.

The government has not controverted that. The government, everytime I mention the word "number two red" fled from it and the discussion as if I had spoken of a plaque

3

4

5

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

. 20

21

23

25

24

that was to be descended upon the government's case.

Now, on the subject the government has yesterday mentioned to you, on the subject of alleged fingerprints -- and they pointed with great honorarium to a box in which finger-prints were allegedly found. The U.S. Attorney said it was found in Reverend Bubar's car. That is not true.

It was found, if found at all -- if there was such a thing, it never was Reverend Bubar's car. He didn't have his car here. The big lie becomes a reality. Think about it.

Would you think and believe that the government would come forth with a tale that this was found in Reverend Bubar's car, or found that anything with fingerprints was in Reverend Bubar's car? But I ask you a question. I ask the government the same question. Was there any fingerprints of Reverend Bubar in it? The answer is no, for if it had Reverend Bubar's fingerprints in it, I know the government in its true vigilance and diligence would have brought it forth. But they haven't.

But, yet, accusations are simple. Anyone can accuse anyone in this great land. But under God, the truth comes out. This is the truth.

When the government yesterday endeavored to, in its consummation of its alleged strength of their case, referred to certain amounts that were paid on subject of printing presses -- but they didn't say that word, they said anything that they wanted to, for that was their turn to present to you.

SANDERS. GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

. 1

7

9 10

8

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

23

25

You will note, as you recall, and recall well. I trust. that when I examined the special agent that they brought in from Washington, D.C. of the FBI, as to any notations, other than the notations or writings on a check, that the agent, after I pressed, and I do press, sometimes strenuously -- and I asked him, "Did you examine the handwriting on the right side, not on the stub side, but the right side of the rages, or certain page?", he said, "No, sir."

And I asked a further question: "Could you explain to me your reason why you didn't?"

And his answer was, "I was never asked to by the U.S. Attorney."

Query. The answer is with you.

If the government was as certain, wouldn't it have been the likelihood that they would have asked their own cooperating witness, government function of the FBI, to test the handwriting? The opportunity was there. They had this book for so many months, and I might relate they had this book perhaps all the way back to March, 1975, when I was ordered to produce it here together with Reverend Bubar. Think about it.

Query. Reason. Answer. Yours.

If they felt that it was the handwriting of the Reverend Bubar. But they didn't do it.

It's very similar to many years ago, I saw, in a certain place, as recited, a man swung a lantern about 25 times,

> SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN CONNECTICUT

and the question was asked, "Well, was that lantern lit?"

2

And the answer by the great Chick Sales was, "They

3

never asked me to light it."

5

a car that he was just using. Couldn't it have been placed?

6

Couldn't this have been placed in the trunk of that car by anyone?

As to the car that Reverend Bubar had that day, it was

7

Question is mine; answer is for you to evaluate.

8

Now, here, in this court -- and the Court will

9

instruct you, as I not only alluded to, but did state, as to the

10

legal ramifications and the respected charges -- Reverend Bubar

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is an acknowledged person all over the country. If you will note, there were witnesses here from California on the subject of printing and printing presses. There were people here from Memplis, Tennessee on the subject

of printing and printing presses. There was a gentlemen that

came here at our own cost from Shreveport, Louisiana.

Reverend Bubar has lectured all over the country, in fact, is known all over the world. Does that mean because he is known all over the world that he should put himself in a dungeon without a phone and speak to people who call upon him or seek his knowledge or his guidance? For to do that makes America

Russia, and God forbid it should ever happen here. God forbid.

It could harmen here. Think about it.

Now, the U.S. Attorney, yesterday, at great moment in presenting their case, stated the word -- if but once, at

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

least 20 times -- the word "cover up". Cover up what? Everything that they wanted to throw the burden upon Reverend Bubar, all they had to say is the word, "Reverend Bubar, cover up."

Becomes synonymous. Interchange it. That interchangeability is an invention of the U. S. Attorney's office.

What was he covering up? Nothing. Why the phraseology of the word "cover up", not once, but at least 10, 15 or 20 times?

Woll, I might say it might be the methodology or the modus operandi of the United States Government in an endeavor to implicate Reverend Bubar into something he knew nothing about.

That's for you to consider.

For right now I could be accused of many cover-ups.

Cover up what? You have to be an elected gentus to fill in the words "cover up", but the government doesn't, because the government can make accusations at their will.

But the truth is in God's hands, not mine. The truth is as you view it to be, not as I tell it to you.

The government is the power. The people have been reduced to decimation.

The government cares not in this case one iota as to the rights of any accused, and Reverend David Bubar, they have only one purpose: the purpose of an endeavor, and the sole endeavor, to convict anyone, innocent or no.

I assert it, I claim it, and I have no fear to make the claim or make the assertion. Couldn't that claim be also made

. 1

. 1

about you fine people?

If you were any place, could you recall that each and every time where you were, exact times that you were there, what phone calls you had, who you spoke to, who called you, what was said?

But let's analyze one thing. In all of the alleged phone calls that was subscribed here to with graphs and documentation, of charts and writings and color schemes and eludication of red means this and blue means that, has there ever been any recorded tape recording, bugging, that produced the voice of Reverend David Bubar?

If there was, why was it held back from you, ladies and gentlemen? If there was, and it was held back from you, it's a violation of the rights of an accused.

If there was, and a request was at any time desired by the government to portray it on a tape recorder, I'm sure the learned Court would have evaluated and made his independent, judicious ruling. For this Court has never -- in all the weeks that we've been here -- has never made one ruling to take away the rights, constitutional rights, of any accused.

But the question is: has the government done so?

That's the question. That's for you to consider. Have the government done so? Has the government have any motive with the exception of the motive and desire for conviction? That, likewise, is for you to analyze and for you to determine.

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters Reverend Bubar.

. 1

I know the hour is late. I know I have some more time. I shall endeavor to use that time with the best method of analyses that I am capable of as a dedicated counsel for

I might add that the discussion with reference to Mr. Nixon is an exhibit, a full exhibit, which will likewise come into the jury room for your evaluation.

Now, endeavoring to become specific in the remaining time, and I shall, I ask you to consider that a man who had the right -- and thank God, that right has never been taken away from us, for it it had, I might have been powerless except by the protections of the Constitution of the United States and this great democracy and stand up and speak as I do, but if the right of mobility is taken away from any one of you, or me, or anyone else in America, then America will not stand; but, yet, our forefathers have protected these rights, and I stand in respect to these protections.

Ladies and gentlemen, it makes no difference where you go, what you do, even how you think, under a free democracy; but autocracy, which is endeavored to be perpetrated upon our nation right now, it does make a difference.

So if any one of you ladies and gentlemen, while you are in that jury room -- and this is your hallowed inner sanctum that no one will invade, except God -- if you cannot respectfully present your views, your analyses, your interpretation, your

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

6

7

5

8

9

10.

11

12

13

15

45

0

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

24

- 11

feelings, your experiences as to the facts, yea, even unto the direction of the charges that will be explained to you, the charges to the jury, I say that everything that we have done here is for naught, and under God, I trust, it never shall be for naught.

Reverend Bubar has traveled all over. In fact, I have traveled with him. Reverend Bubar has spoken to so many people of all position, and in his presence, I have likewise. If I thought for one moment that traveling with Reverend Bubar would make me subject to accusations, I might think a second time, but I relied upon the most significant thing we have: our Constitution of the United States.

So whether Reverend Bubar went to Connecticut or to Jesse James' hole in the wall in Cheyenne, Wyoming, it matters not, that's his inherent right of mobility.

Now, as to Reverend Bubar's right to think as he will, that is his inherent right, and if Reverend Bubar were to -- as we leave the courtroom today, and as the learned Court goes down the elevator, with proper amenity and respect -- if Reverend Bubar says, "Good evening, Judge Newman," that's his right of freedom, too, and that's my right of freedom, and that's your right of freedom, the right to be able to go wherever you want to while we have an America that's standing as distinguished from all other countries.

Now, it is so simple to be accused of anything. I've

been accused of many things. I've been accused of changing shoes. I've been accused of wearing certain white shoes on certain days and certain blacks shoes on other days. And it's true.

But if I had to tell you the reasons why I do things,
I would be -- you would be invading my right of privacy, and I
know no one would do it. But it could happen, couldn't it?
And if a person wanted to say he wears white shoes only on
certain days and for certain purposes, that, too, would be an
invasion.

I'm asking that all of these alleged charges that are being made here, that Reverend Bubar had no knowledge of, but, yet, charged with, who had no participation of, but charged with the commission of certain alleged crimes. Ladies and gentlemen, it could happen to you, it could happen to any one of us.

We have to consider who is accusing, on one hand, and who is being accused, on the other hand. Shall I be accused because I have gray hair and a bald spot as distinguished from someone who has his full hair and who has his own wave?

I must respect him or her or them, and they must respect my rights as well, so long as we have a democracy.

Reverend Bubar, by the accusations that have been made by the government, instead of tribute being paid to Reverend Bubar for his good, kind work to help people, to give succor,

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

s-u-c-c-o-r, suddenly he's put in position that he is to be considered by the government for the assertion of his respectful rights as a s-u-c-k-e-r, to me, is an abominable effort of methodology by the government.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to consider, and consider well, do you think a person with sanity, in their right mind, or better, yet, would you, if you knew this was going to happen, would have been there, or would you have been maybe in China, maybe in France, maybe in Italy, Rome, in the Vatican, or would you have been there, if you knew?

Think about the words "if you knew". Remembering well that Reverend Bubar has always done good for people, but then I ask you the question. The question is summed up in my devotions and my respect to you.

Who is being weighed here? There are two sets of scales. Who is being weighed here? A man, John W. Shaw, a pathological liar, coached with beauty and absolute finesse; and Reverend Bubar, who has never harmed a soul in his life, nor ever intended to, who has always helped the poor, has always helped people, who has always given of himself beyond the call of duty. Ask the thousands of people who have called the Spiritual Outreach Society, and the phone number, and it was of great moment here — the phone number of 901-274-4300, or 901-274-7600. Who do you want to believe? Do you want to believe someone the comes here with absolute impurities and

and contamination and wishes to contaminate this entire courtroom?

Or do you wish to believe a man who has only one purpose in

life: to serve God?

I ask one thing. I ask you to consider, and consider well -- and I did state to the Court, and I have endeavored to comply, that I did not and would not, continue beyond propriety any of the matters which I had discussed in my first hour and a half -- but I ask one thing: for the only thing we're seeking here is the truth, and there's by one way to the truth, ladies and gentlemen, and that truth is epitomized and recorded in this book, the Bible.

In the First Chronicles: 16; 22, when the Heavenly Father, as recorded, said to kings and queens and governments and judges, "Touch not my annointed," please remember Reverend Bubar is an annointed of the Master, and there's but one ring to the truth, and that truth is thataway, on high.

-000 -

SANDERS, GALE & RUSSELL Certified Stenotype Reporters

664 PROSPECT AVENUE LARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

141 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT No. 2 31 38

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

· SUPERIOR COURT,

vs.

COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD (BRIDGEPORT).

DAVID BUBAR

OCTOBER 16, 1975.

FINDING ON MOTION TO REVIEW APPLICATION OF FUDGLEY L. ZALOWITZ TO APPEAR PRO HAC VICE

FIRST: The following facts are found:

- 1. The petitioners are defendant and defendant's counsel Richard T. Meehan. The petition on behalf of Rudolph L. Zalowitz was filed by Connecticut counsel, Richard T. Meehan, who had previously entered his general appearance for the defermant.
- 2. Mr. Zalowitz was admitted to the New Jersey bar in 1938 and is a member in good standing.
- 3. Mr. Zalowitz has never appeared in the state courts of Connecticut in the capacity of an out-of-state attorney.

FILED

OCT 23 1975

SUPERIOR COURT BRIDGEPORT

- in relation to the allegations of the pending information several days after March 1, 1975, the date that the defendant is alleged to have committed the crimes charged in the pending information.
  - 5. Attorney Zalowitz accompanied the defendant to Connecticut at the request of the FBI and the state police on at least two occasions.
  - 6. Attorney Zalowitz appeared with the defendant in court proceedings in the District Court of Connecticut as counsel of record on March 12, 1975, April 9, 1975, pril 11, 1975, and June 12, 1975.
    - 7. At best, Attorney Zalowitz has had very limited trial experience in the Superior Court of New Jersey.

: :

.

- 8. Prior to March 1, 1975, Attorney Zalowitz had never represented Mr. Bubar as trial counsel anywhere.
- 9. Attorney Zalowitz claimed that the defendant would come to see him "every several months when [dilendant] came to New York on his lecture tours."
- 10. On these occasions Attorney Zalowitz claimed the defendant would ask for certain advice on civil matters, none of which related to this case, but Attorney Zalowitz refused to specify beyond this broad general statement.

- ll. Attorney Zalowitz refused to indicate any details showing he had acquired a specialized skill or knowledge with respect to this client's affairs important to the trial of the cause we had acquired prior to the present case, nor has he shown other good cause.
- 12. The defendant expressed his desire to have Attorney Zalowitz appear as co-counsel in this case.
- 13. The defendant retained Attorney Meehan through Attorney Zalowitz to represent him in this case, and approved of Mr. Meehan's representation.
- five to ten criminal cases to a conclusion in the Superior

  Court of New Jersey during the past five years, but when

  pressed by the court to produce the names of them and

  given a weekend to gather the information, he was able to

  name only two or possibly three that could be considered

  as having been tried to a conclusion. Obviously his answer

  to the court's question as originally given was inflated and

  inaccurate.
  - Exhibit 2 does not show cases that were actually tried to completion except possibly for two or three.

SECOND: The court ruled as follows on the application:

appear as counsel subject to certain limitations set forth in the court's memorandum of decision dated and filed June 30, 1975.

## THIRD:

- 17. The present motion for review was filed late and should, therefore, be dismissed.
- 18. The court's decision was filed June 30, 1975.

  The motion to review was not filed until September 22, 1975, and no intervening steps were taken by the petitioners to indicate any intention of filing for review as required by the Practice Act.

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 1140

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appelle,

VS.

DAVID N. BUBAR, et al, Defendants-Appellants.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that I have this day caused to be mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, one copy of the brief and supplemental appendix of David N. Bubar to each of the following: Peter C. Dorsey, United States Attorney (together with a copy of Supplemental Exhibits), P.O. Box 1824, 141 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511;
Andrew B. Bowman, Esq., 770 Chapel Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510; Gregory B. Craig, Esq., 30 South Street, Middlebuty, Vermont 05753; Alan Neigher, Esq., 855 Main Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604; J. Daniel Saragin, Esq., 855 Main Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604; Igor I. Sikorsky, Jr., Esq., 111 Pearl Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06103; Rudolph Lion Zalowitz, Esq., 213 Ross Avenue, Hackensack, New Jersey 07601; and David N. Bubar, 40225, Box PMB, Atlanta, Georgia 30315.

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut, this 23rd day of September, 1976.

Paul W. Orth

Attorney for David N. Bubar

